APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,321	03/17/2004	Stefan Bengt Edlund	IBM-014	3735

51835 7590 05/03/2007	EXAMINER
IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW	RAYYAN, SUSAN F
c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ	

5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK	2167	
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752		

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/802,321	EDLUND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan F. Rayyan	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *April 6, 2007 (interview)*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20,26 and 27* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20,26 and 27* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-20, 26-27 are pending.

2.   Claims 21-25 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-17, 19-20, 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent Publication Number 2003/0172113 A1 issued

to Brian A. Cameron et al ("Cameron") in view of US 2004/0230598 issued to

Stephen Robertson et al ("Robertson").

As per independent claim 1, Cameron teaches synchronizing a client having a client

database with a server having a server database and transmitting documents

(paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client).

Cameron does not explicitly teach calculating a document score for each of a

plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an

importance of the document to the client and transmitting one of the documents in the

server database to the client based on a respective document score. Robertson does

teach these limitations (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the

score that indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile

scoring file match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20 lines 15-19, sending

document to user) to deliver to a user , electronic documents that a user may find

relevant . It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention was made to modify Cameron with calculating a document score for

each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score

designating an importance of the document to the client and transmitting one of the

documents) to deliver to a user , electronic documents that a user may find relevant as

described by Robertson (paragraph 1, lines 14-15).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting the one of the documents in the server

database to the client if the respective document score exceeds a threshold value

(paragraph 61, threshold value).

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score for one of the documents is determined from

at least one of a time of creation of the document, a number of times the document has

been read, a time of last access of the document, an author of the document and a term

in the document (paragraph 20, terms(weighted) in document are compared to terms in

user profile and paragraph 49, score is stored in the profile score field which indicates

how well the terms in the document are associated with the terms in the user profile).

As per claim 5 same as claim arguments above and Robinson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score is determined from a relationship between the

document and another of the documents in the server database(paragraph 65, as

retrieved set of previous relevant documents are stored in the user profile and used in

determining document score).

As per claim 6 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting one of the documents in the server

database to the client ...if the one of the documents is not stored in the client database

(paragraph 8,10, server documents are downloaded to the client (small device)).

Cameron does not explicitly teach a document score. Robertson does teach these

limitations (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the score that

indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile scoring file

match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20, lines 15-19, sending document to

user) to deliver to a user , electronic documents that a user may find relevant . It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to modify Cameron with a document to deliver to a user , electronic

documents that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson (paragraph 1, lines

14-15).

As per claim 7 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

determining if the client database includes a newly created document and transmitting

the newly created document to the server (paragraph 42, lines 1-5, synchronizing

document additions).

As per claim 9 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

determining if the client database includes a modified document and transmitting the

modified document to the server (paragraph 28, edited documents on client are

transmitted to the server).

As per claim 11 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the client database includes a plurality of client documents, the method further

comprising designating for deletion one of the client documents based on a document

score of a complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, deleting

document from client).

As per claim 12 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

wherein the client database includes a plurality of client documents, the method further

comprising removing one of the client documents from the client database... of a

complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, deleting document

from client).

As per claim 13 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising resolving a conflict between the modified document in the client

database and a modified document in the server database (paragraph 100, conflicting

parts of documents are resolved).

As per claim 14 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising removing the designation for deletion based on a document score of

the complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, updating

document).

As per claim 15 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising increasing a data storage capacity of the client by deleting the one of

the client documents designated for deletion (paragraph 12, deleted documents

increase the storage capacity).

As per independent claim 16 Cameron teaches:

A computer program product for use with a computer system having a server with a

server database, the server database storing a plurality of documents accessible to a

client(paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client).

Cameron does not explicitly teach program code for calculating a document score for

each of the documents, the document score designating an importance of the document

to a client; and program code for transmitting one of the documents in the server

database to the client based on a respective document score. Robertson does teach

these limitations (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the score

that indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile scoring file

match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20, lines 15-19, sending document to

user) to deliver to a user , electronic documents that a user may find relevant. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to modify Cameron with program code for calculating a document score for

each of the documents, the document score designating an importance of the document

to a client and program code for transmitting one of the documents in the server

database to the client based on a respective document score   to deliver to a user ,

electronic documents that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson

(paragraph 1, lines 14-15).

As per claim 17 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the program code embodied in the computer useable medium further

comprises program code for determining a threshold value, the one of the documents in

the server database being transmitted to the client if the respective document score

exceeds the threshold value(paragraph 61, threshold value).

As per claim 19 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score for one of the documents is determined from

at least one of a time of creation of the document, a number of times the document has

been read, a time of last access of the document, an author of the document and a term

in the document(paragraph 20, terms(weighted) in document are compared to terms in

user profile and paragraph 49, score is stored in the profile score field which indicates

how well the terms in the document are associated with the terms in the user profile).

As per claim 20 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score is determined from a relationship between the

document and another of the documents in the server database(paragraph 65, as

retrieved set of previous relevant documents are stored in the user profile and used in

determining document score).

As per independent claim 26 Cameron teaches:

An apparatus for synchronizing a client having a client database with a server having a

server database(paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and

client).

Cameron does not explicitly teach means for calculating a document score for each

of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an

importance of the document to the client; and means for transmitting one of the

documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score.

Robertson does teach these limitations (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the score that indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile scoring file match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20, lines 15-19, sending document to user) to deliver to a user, electronic documents that a user may find relevant. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron with calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an importance of the document to the client and means for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score to deliver to a user, electronic documents that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson (paragraph 1, lines 14-15).

As per claim 27 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

further comprising means for determining a threshold value, the one of the documents in the server database being transmitted to the client if the respective document score exceeds the threshold value(paragraph 61, threshold value).

Claims 3,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cameron in view of Robertson as applied to claims 1-2, 16 above, and further in view of US 7,092,977 B2 issued to Albert Leung et al ("Leung").

As per claim 3 same as claim arguments above and Cameron in view of Robertson do not explicitly teach the threshold value based on a data storage capacity of the client. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold) to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron in view of Goodwin with the threshold value based on a data storage capacity of the client to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources as described by Leung (Abstract).

As per claim 18 same as claim arguments above and Cameron in view of Goodwin do not explicitly teach wherein the determination of the threshold value is based on a data storage capacity of the client. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold) to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron in view of Goodwin with the determination of the threshold value is based on a data storage capacity of the client to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources as described by Leung (Abstract).

Claims 8,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cameron in view of Robertson as applied to claims 1,7,9 above, and further in view of US 2005/0071741 issued to Anurag Acharya et al ("Acharya").

As per claim 8 same as claim arguments above and Cameron in view of Robertson do not explicitly teach further comprising assigning a document score having a maximum value to the newly created document . Acharya does teach this limitation (paragraph 0043 as modifying document scores based on the age of the document which equates to a newly created document) to improve the quality of search results. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron in view of Robertson with assigning a document score having a maximum value to the newly created document to improve the quality of search results as described by Acharya (paragraph 10).

As per claim 10 same as claim arguments above and Cameron in view of Robertson do not explicitly teach further comprising assigning a document score having a maximum value to the modified document . Acharya does teach this limitation (paragraph 0043 as modifying document scores based on the age of the document which equates to a newly modified document) to improve the quality of search results. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron in view of Robertson with assigning a document score having a maximum value to the modified document to improve the quality of search results as described by Acharya (paragraph 10).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-8, filed November 22, 2006, with respect to

the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2, 4-17, 19-20, 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent Publication Number 2003/0172113 A1 issued to

Brian A. Cameron et al ("Cameron") in view of US Patent Number 2003/0158866 A1

issued to James P. Goodwin et al ("Goodwin") and Claims 3,18 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cameron in view of Goodwin et al

("Goodwin") in view of US Patent Number 7,092,977 B2 issued to Albert Leung et al

("Leung") have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has

been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is

made in view of newly found prior art references including US 2004/0230598 issued to

Stephen Robertson et al ("Robertson") and US 2005/0071741 issued to Anurag

Acharya et al ("Acharya"). See rejection above.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is 571-272-

1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sr
4/20/2007

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100